



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/855,179	05/14/2001	Evren Eryurek	P32.12-0006	8196

7590

08/27/2002

Christopher R. Christenson
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY
International Center
900 South Second Avenue, Suite 1600
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER

SUN, XIUQUIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2863

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/855,179

Applicant(s)

ERYUREK ET AL.

Examiner

Xiuqin Sun

Art Unit

2863

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 10, 13-18 and 20-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 9, 11-12 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,4&6-9.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 16-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Burns et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5970430).

Burns et al. disclose a field device coupleable to a fieldbus process communication loop (see abstract; col. 17, lines 66-67 and col. 18, lines 1-19), the device comprising: a power module coupleable to the loop to power the device with energy received from the loop (col. 8, lines 15-20); a fieldbus loop communicator coupleable to the loop, and adapted to bi-directionally communicate over the loop (col. 7, lines 57-67); a controller coupled to the fieldbus loop communicator (col. 7, lines 57-67); diagnostic circuitry coupled to the controller and operably coupleable to the loop directly or indirectly (col. 17, lines 50-65), the diagnostic circuitry adapted to measure a loop-related parameter (col. 17, lines 50-65 and col. 26, lines 17-67); and wherein the controller provides diagnostic information based upon the loop-related parameter (col. 20, lines 13-67); said fieldbus process communication loop is selected from

Art Unit: 2863

the group consisting of FOUNDATIONTM fieldbus (H1), ProfibusTM and WorldFIP et al. (col. 1, lines 59-67; col. 25, lines 42-49; and col. 29, lines 37-44); said diagnostic circuitry includes a temperature sensor adapted to provide a signal related to temperature of a fieldbus communication circuit in the field device (col. 10, lines 54-67); the loop related parameter is instantaneous current drawn by the field device (col. 8, lines 33-49); the diagnostic circuitry measures a plurality of loop related parameters, and wherein the controller provides a diagnostic signal based upon a combination of the loop-related parameters (col. 2, lines 47-58 and col. 27, lines 38-49); the diagnostic circuitry is adapted to measure a plurality of loop-related parameters and provide failure prediction based upon the plurality of loop-related parameters (col. 10, lines 36-53; col. 15, lines 58-67 and col. 16, lines 1-18); the diagnostic information is indicated from the loop communicator to a computerized maintenance management system for maintenance work orders (col. 13, lines 6-32). Burns et al. further teach: a method of providing diagnostics on a fieldbus process communication loop (col. 4, lines 61-67; col. 5, lines 1-14 and col. 6, lines 14-29), the method comprising: operably coupling diagnostic circuitry to the fieldbus process communication loop (col. 17, lines 50-65); measuring a parameter of the loop (col. 17, lines 50-65; col. 22, lines 20-41 and col. 26, lines 51-67); analyzing the parameter to provide a diagnostic output (col. 27, lines 22-38).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2863

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns et al. in view of Sprecher (U.S. Pat. No. 6425038) and Ruckley et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6360277).

Burns et al. teach a device that includes the subject matter discussed above. Burns et al. do not mention explicitly: said group from which the fieldbus process communication loop is selected includes ControlNet, P-Net, SwiftNet, Interbus-S, and FOUNDATION™ Fieldbus High-Speed Ethernet (H2).

Sprecher discloses a process control system and teaches the use of such communication protocols as ControlNet and FOUNDATION™ Fieldbus High-Speed Ethernet (col. 4, lines 25-30).

Ruckley et al. discloses a process control system and teaches the use of such communication protocols as P-Net, SwiftNet and Interbus-S (col. 3, lines 1-14).

It would have been obvious to include the teaching of Sprecher ControlNet and Ethernet communication protocols, and Ruckley P-Net, SwiftNet and Interbus-S communication protocols in the Burns system in order to form a group from which the fieldbus process communication loop can be selected.

Art Unit: 2863

5. Claims 3, 6, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns et al. in view of Anderson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5936514).

Burns et al. teach a method and device that includes the subject matter discussed above. Burns et al. do not mention explicitly: said diagnostic circuitry further comprises an intrinsic safety barrier; the loop-related parameter is instantaneous DC voltage; the loop related parameter is peak to peak communications signal strength on the process communication loop; the loop-related parameter is a characteristic impedance of the loop.

Anderson et al. disclose an input circuit in the field device which receives power from a communication loop, and teach an intrinsic safety barrier (col. 7, lines 20-29). Anderson et al. further teach that: the loop-related parameter is instantaneous DC voltage (col. 4, lines 14-25); the loop related parameter is peak to peak communications signal strength on the process communication loop (col. 3, lines 9-18); the loop-related parameter is a characteristic impedance of the loop (col. 6, lines 61-67 and col. 7, lines 1-11).

It would have been obvious to include the teaching of Anderson intrinsic safety barrier in the Burns system in order to separate a hazardous environment from safe environment, and to include the teaching of Anderson loop-related parameters in the system of Burns in order to provide a more sophisticated field device for process control.

6. Claims 14-15, 21-24 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns et al. in view of Eryurek (U.S. Pat. No. 6047220).

Burns et al. teach a method and device that includes the subject matter discussed above. Burns et al. do not mention explicitly: said controller executes a neural network analysis of the loop-related parameter to provide the diagnostic signal; said controller executes fuzzy logic upon the loop-related parameter to provide the diagnostic signal; said method includes operably coupling the diagnostic circuitry to the loop via a loop communicator to allow the diagnostic circuitry to access data communicated by the loop communicator.

Eryurek discloses a field device for process control (col. 1, lines 47-62) and teaches a controller that executes a neural network analysis of the loop-related parameter to provide the diagnostic signal, and that executes fuzzy logic upon the loop-related parameter to provide the diagnostic signal (col. 5, lines 12-22). Eryurek further teaches a loop communicator that is used to operably couple the data processing unit to the process control loop via a loop communicator to allow the data processing unit to access data communicated by the loop communicator (col. 2, lines 35-67).

It would have been obvious to include the teaching of Eryurek neural network analysis technique, fuzzy logic scheme and loop communicator the Burns system in order to provide a field device with more reliable data communication mechanism and better data analysis algorithm.

7. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns et al.;

Burns et al. teach a method that includes the subject matter discussed above. Burns et al. do not mention explicitly: analyzing the parameter to provide

Art Unit: 2863

a diagnostic output further comprises applying a least squares method analysis to the measured parameter.

It is deemed that the least-squares method for data analysis is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply such a method to analyzing parameters in the system of Burns et al. in order to provide a diagnostic output accurately and efficiently.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 7, 9, 11-12 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Xiuqin Sun whose telephone number is (703)305-3467. The examiner can normally be reached from 7:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hilten can be reached on (703)308-0719. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-5841 for regular communications and (703)308-5841 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2863

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

XS

XS

August 23, 2002.


JOHN S. HILTEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800